

**Report of the CONSER Standard Record (CSR) Monitoring Group  
Apr. 2008**

**Introduction**

The CSR Monitoring Group was charged with reviewing comments and issues that have surfaced since the implementation of the CSR in June 2007, proactively identifying additional issues, and suggesting revisions to the CSR guidelines and other CONSER documentation where necessary.

The group compiled a prioritized list of issues for discussion, based on the following sources:

- summary of issues that require follow-up from the 2007 CONSER Operations meeting
- discussions at Mid-Winter CONSER At Large
- questions posted to the CONSERLST
- posts on the CONSER Wiki

Some issues, such as series, were not discussed, with the understanding that current groups working on these issues are making recommendations in the context of the CSR.

The issues identified by the CSR Monitoring Group are:

- Uniform titles
- Repeatable 260
- 550/710 \$3
- Cataloging with copy
- DBO/LIC/588
- 362

**General Observations**

In general the CSR cataloging process and documentation are working well. The group does not feel the CSR guidelines need much revision, although additional examples and some clarification may be necessary. These examples should be limited to the required elements to keep the documentation simple and concise. The group feels the need to emphasize the philosophy of the CSR more than specific prescriptions and instructions.

**Recommendation:**

1. Create a Web page with examples of optional use of elements, accessible from the CONSER homepage. These examples might be included in future updates to the CEG and CCM. See appendix for some situations where examples may be helpful.

### Specific issues

#### Uniform titles

By far this is the issue that generated the most discussion. Discussions surrounded the question of when it might be appropriate to use a uniform title and qualifier, and inconsistency in practice.

The group does not recommend changing or adding situations where uniform titles might be required or forbidden. There was some concern about CONSER moving in the direction of fewer uniform titles while RDA seems to be moving in the direction of more. The majority of the CSR group feels that we do not know what RDA will look like and we do not want to base current practice on assumptions about RDA.

In the past, the main entry (title, uniform title, or name/title) of a CONSER-authenticated record for a serial provided the authorized AACR2 form of entry for the title, which has been used as an added entry on records for related works, for example, monographs. This raises the question of whether the absence of uniform titles, and the resulting non-unique access points would be a problem in this context.

The uniform title issue generated discussion of system functionality. Several of our questions about whether to add a uniform title stemmed from concern that a patron might be confused if, for example, a title in the 785 is the same as that in the 245 (the print ceases and is continued by the online). The group generally prefers expanding system functionality rather than requiring additional data in a record.

The group discussed several options for coding that could be used to clarify situations where the related record lacks a uniform title. One preferred option is a MARBI proposal defining second indicator 9 [no display constant generated] for 780/785 and using it with \$i. For example:

- 780 09 \$i Continues the print version: \$t [title]  
This also would be useful in situations beyond showing why the title in the link is the same as that in the 245.
- 785 09 \$i Merged with: \$t [title]
- 785 09 \$i To form: \$t [title]
- 785 09 \$i Changed back to: \$t [title]

Other options the group discussed are:

- Prescribing use of \$h in linking fields  
Example: 785 00 \$t Title \$h [electronic resource]
- Prescribing use of \$c in linking fields  
Example: 785 00 \$t [title] \$c (Online)

#### **Recommendation:**

1. Add to the CSR documentation:

## Document 3

- 1) A statement that any addition of a uniform title is acceptable depending on local needs and cataloger's judgment
- 2) The following example of monographic series with a uniform title qualified by "Online". e.g.  
ARN 2842390: Memorias de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona  
ARN 7616342 : Memorias de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona (Online)
2. Form a group to pursue the MARBI proposal defining second indicator 9 for 780/785 to be used with \$i.

### **Repeatable 260**

The group feels that proposed coding guidelines for repeatable 260 (recording publication dates in \$c when first or last issue is in hand and recording coverage information in \$3 when no date is given in \$c) seem overly complicated now that CSR no longer requires dates in \$c.

It was proposed that we associate dates with any particular 260 only when they correspond to that specific place/publisher. Thus, when publication information changes, one should record corresponding coverage information in \$3 rather than in \$c and apply the same to the first instance of 260.

Regarding \$3, the group suggested making it optional and allowing angle brackets as 260 1st indicator value already indicates earliest, intervening and current publishing information.

### **Recommendation:**

1. Let John Attig know we are pursuing repeatable 260 again and let him advise the JSC.
2. Adjust the guidelines per CSR monitoring group discussion and pass on to the original group that put them together. See <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/260-charge.html> for charge and membership of the group.
3. Consult with OCLC to develop a timeline for implementing repeatable 260 fields

### **550/710 \$3**

There has been some confusion about when to use a 550. Appendix A of the CSR documentation and the CSR cheat sheet list the 550 as not required but say to add 550 if a corporate body's name has changed over time. Also the documentation says to use a 550 in minimal and non-CONSER records when authority records will not be created or updated.

550 may still be used if cataloging library is not doing the authority work, or if the relationship of a body to a serial is more complicated than "issued by."

## Document 3

### **Recommendation:**

1. Rather than using a 550 for changes in responsibility over time, use an already-defined \$3 with applicable dates in the 7XX fields.

### **Cataloging with copy**

Working with copy seems to be where catalogers are struggling post CSR implementation. What we need to communicate to catalogers is the overall CSR philosophy. If the documentation spells out something (e.g. DBO in each record), then do as it says. If the documentation is silent, do what seems reasonable under the circumstances. If someone else does something differently, it is no problem.

Appendix A of CSR documentation emphasizes "Do not remove any fields from existing records unless the data in those fields is determined to be incorrect." The group feels the documentation should include the following statements:

**\*\*If factual information on the record is correct, no editing of style or tagging is needed. Leave the information alone.**

**\*\*If new information needs to be supplied, supply it according to CSR guidelines.**

**\*\*If in a particular situation it is more difficult to supply information according to CSR guidelines and the cataloger can easily supply the information according to pre-CSR style, it is fine to do so—by exception. This exception should not be taken as a license to not apply CSR guidelines and style.**

### **Recommendation:**

1. Add to the CSR documentation:
  - 1) A statement reiterating the CSR philosophy as it applies to copy to Appendix A of the CSR documentation.
  - 2) The specific guidelines quoted above.
  - 3) Examples of record maintenance before and after CSR implementation.
  - 4) A reference to CEG B4.3
  - 5) The following explicit instructions about closing pre-AACR2 records:  
Although catalogers may close pre-AACR2 records using pre-AACR2 conventions if desired, they may also use CSR editing conventions, e.g. add an unformatted 362 field with "Ceased with ...". If the cataloger consulted the final issue, then the 500 note for Final issue consulted would be added.

### **DBO/LIC/588**

In June 2007, Robert Bremer proposed replacing phrasing in Description based on and Latest issue consulted notes with subfield codes in a 588 (cataloger note).

Original subfield codes proposed by Robert:

## Document 3

588 \$a General note \$b Issue/part used for description \$c Latest issue/part consulted \$s Source of title \$v Date viewed

Changes suggested by CSR monitoring group:

588 \$a General note \$b Issue used for description \$c Source of title \$d Provider of issue used for description \$e Date viewed \$f Latest issue consulted \$g Provider of latest issue consulted if different than for source of title \$h Date latest issue viewed

Example:

588 \$b Vol. 6, no. 2 (Sept. 2004) \$c caption \$d ScienceDirect \$e June 4, 2007 \$f Vol. 7, no. 2 (Sept. 2005) \$g IngentaConnect \$h Apr. 18, 2008.

To express:

500 Description based on: Vol. 6, no. 2 (Sept. 2004); title from caption (ScienceDirect, viewed June 4, 2007).

500 Latest issue consulted: Vol. 7, no. 2 (Sept. 2005) (IngentaConnect, viewed Apr. 18, 2008).

The group was generally enthusiastic about this idea, and recommends discussion at CONSER Operations Meeting.

### **Recommendation:**

1. Discuss the proposal at the 2008 CONSER Operations Meeting. Do we want to pursue this?

## **362**

Continuing the thread of replacing phrasing with subfield codes, John Hostage suggested a similar approach for 362 in June 2007.

Proposed codes:

362 1st indicator 0 – First issues inspected, 1 – First issue not inspected

362 2nd indicator 0 – Final issue inspected, 1 – Final issue not inspected

Subfield codes: \$a First issue \$b Final issue

Example:

362 00 \$a Vol. 1, no.1 (Jan. 1991) \$b v. 10, no. 12 (Dec. 2000).

To express in CSR:

362 1 \$a Began with Vol. 1 no. 1 (Jan. 1991); ceased with v. 10, no. 12 (Dec. 2000).

There were not many comments on this issue from members of the monitoring group. One suggestion was that we look at using the already-established 363 field before considering a MARBI proposal for the 362.

Another suggestion was to require an LIC even if there is only one issue in hand at the time of cataloging. The consensus on this issue was that, though useful in some situations, it would cause a lot of redundancy. Perhaps the issue could be revisited if we

## Document 3

implement the 588 or new 362 coding or 363. In the meantime, clarifying examples would be helpful.

### **Recommendation:**

1. Coordinate possible subfielding of 362 with the CONSER representative on the RDA/MARBI group.
2. Make changes to CSR documentation, Appendix B, 362, 500, 515 Examples:
  - 1) Replace example 7 with:  
362 1 Began and ceased with 1918 issue.  
500 Description based on first and only issue; title from title page.
  - 2) Add example 8:  
362 1 Began with 1918; ceased with 1924.  
500 Description based on first issue; title from title page.  
[Lack of Latest issue consulted note indicates that only the 1918 issue was consulted in creating the description.]
  - 3) Add example 9:  
362 1 Began with Vol. 11, no. 1 (Apr. 2008).  
500 Description based on first issue; title from issue table of contents page (Blackwell Synergy Web site, viewed Apr. 24, 2008).  
500 Latest issue consulted: Vol. 11, no. 2 (May 2008) (viewed Apr. 24, 2008).
3. Add source of title notes to all DBO examples in Appendix B.
4. Add to CSR documentation this statement: Always give LIC if different than the DBO.

### **The future**

The group feels that since CSR practice is still new, monitoring the CSR implementation should be an ongoing process.

Points for discussion:

- Who should monitor? How?
- If we are maintaining a Web site with examples, who maintains this?
- How do we find about problems/concerns/questions that catalogers are having with CSR practices? Particularly non-CONSER libraries.

## Document 3

### Appendix

#### **Some situations for inclusion in the CSR examples Web page**

- Examples of when a uniform title is not required but might be useful. For example, if we are creating a record for an online serial, and the print is qualified, do we carry over the print qualifier? Do we add “online?” If a serial title that is not unique is needed as an added entry on a monographic record, do we add a uniform title to the serial at that point?
- Uniform title for online translations
- Links for translations (example #38922280)
- Use of 550 if appropriate and 710 \$3

#### **Membership:**

##### Co-Chairs:

Beth Thornton, Univ. of Georgia (Co-chair)

Liping Song, Health Sciences Library System, Univ. of Pittsburgh (Co-chair)

##### Members:

Renette Davis, Univ. of Chicago

Sophie Dong, Univ. of Georgia

Gene Dickerson, Dept. of State

Beth Guay, Univ. of Maryland

Les Hawkins, LC (ex officio)

Miranda Hay, NLM

Elmer Alvin Klebs, LC

Iliana Mitropolitsky, LC

Hien Nguyen (ex officio)

Robert Rendall, Columbia Univ.

Regina Reynolds, NSDP

Steve Shadle, Univ. of Washington